

1915  
Schl

SCHAARMANN

Grabbe's Relation to his Historical Sources

German

A. M.

1915

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS  
LIBRARY

1915  
Schl







GRABBE'S RELATION TO HIS HISTORICAL  
SOURCES

BY

EMIL FERDINAND SCHAARMANN

B. A. University of Illinois, 1914

---

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

IN GERMAN


IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1915



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/grabbesrelationt00scha>



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

June 2 1945

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

*Emil Schaarmann*

ENTITLED *Grabbe's Relation to his Historical Sources*

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF *Master of Arts*

*J. E. Lessing.*  
In Charge of Major Work

*Antony Lockhart*  
Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

} Committee  
on  
Final Examination





1915  
5001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction . . . . .	1
2. Frederick Barbarossa . . . . .	5
3. Henry VI . . . . .	14
4. Conclusion . . . . .	26
5. Bibliography . . . . .	28



## INTRODUCTION

The first Hohenstaufen drama in Germany appeared during Barbarossa's lifetime. It was the so-called "Antichrist Spiel" and was first discovered and published by Von Pez in the Thesaurus Anecd.II, 3: 187-196.

Apart from two comedies, entitled: "Commedia vonn der histori Hertzog Conrads zu Schwaben" and "Conrad von Schwaben" (1635), and a few school plays, we have very little interest shown in the Hohenstaufen until the close of the eighteenth century. Not until such men as J. E. Schlegel, Peter Sturz, and Herder began to refer to this period in history as rich in poetical material, do we find Hohenstaufen dramas to increase. Even Schiller thought seriously at one time of taking up the work.

A large number of these earlier works were either outlines of the whole period or attempts at dramatizing this or that important event. Very little merit can be attached to any of these earlier attempts. Klinger's "Conradin", which appeared in 1784, is probably the only one worthy of mention.

What one might call a growing interest for the Hohenstaufen really first began with Romanticism, when the past was looked upon as the ideal age. During the first decade of the nineteenth century, a great interest was shown in national history, especially in that of the Mediaeval period.

Art now claimed as its own the ideals of the old Christian Catholic Church. Literature drew upon valuable poetical material of the Middle Ages, including the Hohenstaufen period.

The two foremost agitators connected with the renewed interest in the Hohenstaufen were A. W. Schlegel and Ludwig Tieck.





Due to their influence, a number of new dramas now appeared with a patriotic tendency of a more or less conventional type.

The best of these were Blomberg's *Conradin v. Schwaben*, 1813, and Karoline's Pichler's *Heinrich v. Hohenstaufen*. It was also at this time that Körner, Uhland, and Platen made their attempts.

The most important movement in the history of the Hohenstaufen drama was during the later romantic period. In 1825 Friedrich v. Raumer completed his history of the Hohenstaufen, a work which Tieck regarded as classical. This work was the direct cause of the many new attempts at dramatizing this period. Like mushrooms, Hohenstaufen dramas now began to shoot up everywhere. Of ten aspiring authors, seven dramatized the fall of Conradin, the last Hohenstaufen.

In 1826 Buchner wrote his *Henry VI*. In 1827, Raupach's "*Agnes v. Hohenstaufen*" was played in Berlin, and in 1828, Heyden published his "*Kampf der Hohenstaufen*."

The three chief dramatists who made use of Raumer as a source were Ernest Raupach, Karl Immermann, and Christian Dietrich Grabbe.

Raupach's work of six volumes has but little poetical value. It is a mere dramatization of Raumer's history, or a "presentation of Barbarossa by holding fast to Raumer's leading string." What Raupach strove for was stage effect. He succeeded in pleasing the ear and eye, but not the deeper feeling of the soul.

Karl Immermann's *Frederick II* is a work of a much higher dramatical character than are any of Raupach's productions.



This is principally due to his inserting more invented scenes where the actual facts failed to answer the purpose. Quite frequently, however, he overlooked dramatically valuable incidents or employed events which were almost entirely void of poetical merit.

The greatest dramatist of the three was Grabbe. Like his contemporaries, he used Raumer as his source, and like them sought to give the history of the period which his Barbarossa and his Henry VI covered. Unlike them, he subordinated history to poetry. Poetical value to him was superior to historical exactness. This does not mean that Grabbe's works are not historical. They are more so than those of his contemporaries, because they present the true spirit of history, a spirit which Grabbe very profitably presents at the expense of literal history. Being conscious of this last fact, and knowing how to detect dramatical elements, Grabbe has eliminated from the great mass of material all irrelevant matter and yet has left the whole in content and form a production at once historical and poetical.

In analyzing the construction of his works, we find a combination of groups of scenes which divide themselves into acts. Every act is again divided into from one to five scenes, each of which is a development or an elaboration, by means of invented scenes and characters, of from one to four actual events.

The extent to which Grabbe has used actual facts and the extent to which he has employed inventions, including the justification of the latter, will be illustrated in the following two chapters. Chapter two will treat his Frederick Barbarossa, and chapter three, his Henry VI.





## FREDERICK BARBAROSSA

In the first act of Frederick Barbarossa, Grabbe made but little use of real historical facts. Both scenes are as a whole invented. That which has been literally taken from Raumer is the mention of the salting of the ruins of Milan. The enmity between the emperor and the pope and the latter's alliance with the Italian league is very well expressed in the attitude of the several characters in the first scene. These characters themselves, however, are not mentioned in the author's source.

In the second scene, Wilhelm, Ludolph, Giso, and the two Bavarians are also invented. Those characters which do appear in history are Frederick, Henry the Lion, and Otto v. Wittelsbach. With these characters, and especially in his Henry, Grabbe has very cleverly given the general teutonic attitude toward Frederick's Italian policy.

An example of the author's skill in combining widely separated events, we have demonstrated in Milan being still in ruins nine years after the rebuilding of the city had begun. Another combination of a slightly different character is the events taking place on the Lombard plains, most of which, according to the author's source, are taken from the Diet of Besancon in 1157 and at Pavia in 1167.

The execution of the tardy Milanese delegates and the outlawing of the duke Zarangia are two purely invented scenes which have no historical value except to illustrate the harsh exactness of the Emperor and the crime of disobedience. The



utter disregard for the threat from the pope's delegate is the first hint of the Hohenstaufen "respect" for papal authority.

Taking the act as a whole, we have Raumer's simple statement of Barbarossa's crossing the Alps and his planning to meet the Italians in battle used as a center around which the author has arranged living characters and appropriate events, and in such a way as to construct a poetical historical sequence.

Act two is an account of Henry the Lion's desertion and the battle of Legnano, including the outcome. In this act Grabbe has made more use of actual facts and has given more literal quotations than he has done anywhere else in the drama.

Taking a bird's eye view, as it were, of the entire chain of events connected with Barbarossa's career, Grabbe saw at once that Frederick's destiny first became dramatically interesting with the turning point at Legnano. With skillful economy, he chose only those events which represent the climax of the development, and then clothed them with necessary events and characters of his own, in order to bring forth a dramatical whole. Nothing actually based on the author's source appears in the first scene.

Those parts coinciding literally with the author's source in the second scene are (1) the words of Truchsess: "Herzog, die Krone, die du jetzt zu deinem Fuss siehst, schmückt dir bald dein Haupt."; (2) Alfred v. Rodens' reply: "Ich fürchte sie wächst ihm übers Haupt"; and (3) the consoling words of Beatrice: "Lieber Herr, Gott wird dir seine Hilfe leihen, gedenkst du einst an diesen Tag." Besides these literal reproductions, Grabbe has taken from Raumer (1) Frederick's humiliation; (2) Henry's reason for deserting the Emperor and his taking with him the greater





part of the imperial army; (3) the joy of the Milanese upon hearing of the Duke's departure; and (4) Frederick's anxiety.

The third scene, the battle itself, presents as actual facts (1) Frederick's defeat, and the rumor of his death; (2) the death of the color bearer - but not that it was Otto v. Wittelsbach; (3) Frederick's willingness to make peace with the pope; and (4) Beatrice's reuniting with Frederick after the battle. These four events, the author has supplied with live characters both as to names and as to personality, and has placed them as nearly as possible in their natural environment.

The invented incidents in this act are principally of two types, those which could have and probably did occur, and those which are contrary to known historical facts.

Scene one is an illustration of the first type. It is an elaboration of Raumer's mere mention of Henry's planning to leave the Emperor. Although an invention, it is a true representation of the Guelf character, and its attitude toward the Ghibelline. The former, feeling himself now equal to the latter, regards further submission to inferior strength below his dignity. Yet Henry loves Frederick. Many have been the favors that the Emperor has shown him. His great strength was in fact due to Frederick's generosity and benevolence. Yet, should not the superior in strength exercise the highest authority? And then, why should Henry sacrifice the flower of his army in the service of the Emperor, whose Italian campaign in no way benefited the Guelf cause?

In the characters of Truchsess and Count Orla, we have illustrations of the Teutonic truth and fidelity to their imme-



diatc lord. Both soldiers are trusted knights of the Emperor. They, however, only feel themselves duty bound to follow him while their "Herzog" remains his true vassal; but as Henry breaks with Frederick, their bonds of allegiance with him also sever, and their greatest ambition is now to raise to the highest power and authority their Guelf leader, for whom they are ready to sacrifice not only the good of the empire, but also their own personal interests. Alfred v. Roden and Count Andechs are also vassals of Henry, but contrary to the above mentioned knights, they feel themselves honor and duty bound to remain true to their Emperor. A feeling of horror comes over them at the thought of leaving him, and especially at this critical time; therefore they entreat their immediate lord to reconsider his plans and remember the kindness received at the hands of him whom he now wishes to desert. Enraged at being reminded of the source of his strength, and at their superior regard for his adversary, Henry has the two noblemen rudely put in chains and later executed.

In the beginning of the second scene we have Grabbe's idea of the Emperor's home life, emphasizing especially Beatrice's love and regard for her husband, and his deep affection for her. That which follows is a dramatization of Raumer's statement of the conversation between Henry and Frederick, of which very little is invented. The incident when the Emperor arises and orders Henry to be taken prisoner, which results in a sudden division of the imperial army and in Beatrice's stepping between the two leaders, begging them to settle the matter on German soil, is not given in the author's source.





The arrival of the Archbishop of Mainz at this time is contrary to historical facts. The Emperor had repeatedly tried to unite his troops with those of the Archduke, but failed in every attempt. Raumer has coming to the aid of Barbarossa at this time, the Archbishop of Cologne, Trier, and Magdeburg, the bishop of Münster and Worms, and the Count of Flanders, none of whom are mentioned by Grabbe. He used instead the Archbishop Christian, presented him as a strong reinforcement, and in this way disposed of the many characters without omitting any material necessary to make the scene dramatically effective.

The inventions which are contrary to history are (1) Otto v. Wittelsbach's death, and (2) Frederick reuniting with Beatrice at the Castle of Hohenstaufen. According to Raumer Otto v. Wittelsbach received the dukedom of Saxony upon Frederick's return to Germany, and the Emperor was reunited with Beatrice at Pavia, whither he fled during the battle.

In the remaining imaginary events, which in every way agree with the customary views of mediæval warfare, every character and incident serves its purpose in illustrating either the bravery and strength of the combatants or the natural environment surrounding them.

Closing the second scene with Barbarossa's retreat to the Alps, where he decides to make peace with the pope, Grabbe now omits the incidents from May 29, 1176 to August 1, 1177. This entire time, history tells us, was occupied in deciding upon the place where the peace conference should be held. These incidents the author regarded as dramatically irrelevant, and therefore first took up the chain of events again where the pope



is awaiting the arrival of the Emperor in Venice.

The first scene of the third act is as a whole again an artistic dramatization of a few historical facts. It opens with the pope and the Doge engaged in a friendly conversation. They are interrupted by a servant who announces the presence of the Archbishop of Mainz and the Milanese Consul; both are received and interview the pope until a second servant enters to announce Montferrat's return from Palestine. He tells of the fall of Jerusalem, to which the pope replies that he will send Barbarossa on a crusade. At this moment Frederick and King Henry enter and humiliate themselves before their papal Lord. They also agree to sign the treaty of peace and the Emperor promises to rid the Holy Land of the heathen menace. The entire conference now steps out on the veranda to be received by the people with thundering applause.

During this confusion, Frederick secretly leaves the veranda, and, coming in to Henry, who refused to step out, he persuades him to give up his first love, and to hasten to Sicily and marry Constance. The scene closes with the Emperor leaving for the north and his son for Sicily.

The events in this scene which are in substance true are the final arrival of Frederick in Venice and his humiliation before the pope. In the terms of peace, Grabbe has omitted the six year truce with William of Sicily and the fifteen year armistice with the Lombard League.

The incident concerning Montferrat is purely invented. It lends itself well in aiding to introduce Frederick's intention of going on a crusade. The news of the fall of Jerusalem





first reached Europe ten years later. It was also at this time that the Emperor first made known his intention of reconquering Palestine.

In scene two we have an account of Frederick's reuniting with the Empress.

Beatrice is told of knights nearing the castle. She at once imagines them to be messengers, bringing the official news of her husband's death. Frederick with his attendants enters, but she does not recognize him. He finally raises his visor, and great is now her joy. He informs her of the peace with the pope and of the calling of a Diet in Mainz, where Henry the Lion is to be tried and the greatest of all tournaments is to be held.

According to Raumer, the logical place for this scene is immediately after the battle of Legnano, for it was during this battle that the Emperor fled to Pavia and there met the Empress, who later accompanied him to Venice.

Grabbe placed the scene after the peace conference and changed the meeting place to the Castle of Hohenstaufen so as to be able to bridge over, as it were, the time from August, 1177, to the meeting of the Diet in Mainz in 1184, which is reducing a period of seven years to a few minutes. Yet nothing is lacking to produce the desired poetical effect.

The actual events taking place during these seven years the author has presented in his fourth act and last act. In the former we have an account of the tournament at Mainz and of a scene in Henry the Lion's camp. In the latter, the battle on the Weser and Henry's departure for England is presented. Ac-



According to history the fifth act should stand in between the two scenes of act four. Grabbe has changed this order undoubtedly because of the fact that Frederick's triumph over Henry and the latter's exile would make a far better climax than the Diet and tournament at Mainz, which the author has placed first. In the treatment of the events at Mainz Grabbe has emphasized and developed principally those elements which would serve in producing dramatical effect. Therefore, all incidents, whether real or not real, that did not serve this purpose were omitted. Consequently we have no events that actually happened at this time appearing in the scene. Instead Grabbe employed as the chief event an incident which occurred at the Diet of Glenhausen six years earlier. For he saw in the outlawing of Henry and the division of his estate more poetical material than in the chief actual event, namely, the trouble between two clergymen who quarreled over a seat of honor in church. Although void of actual events, the scene is not lacking in presenting a typical Mediaeval tournament, and through its characters, it clearly represents the festival at Mainz.

The introduction of Heinrich v. Ofterdingen is an assumption based on Raumer's intimation that the "author of the Nibelungen might have been present at this occasion."

The second scene takes us again into the Guelf camp. In general character it is similar to the first scene of act one, except that the same knights who in the former scene were praising the Emperor, are now condemning him. No historical facts have been introduced. Contrary to history Waldemar of Denmark





and the Grandduke of Lithuania are represented as allies of Henry. The former offered to assist him, provided he would first make peace with the surrounding clergy. This Henry refused to do, and when the Emperor declared war against the Duke, Waldemar remained neutral. The Grand Duke is mentioned in Grabbe's source, but not his coming to Henry's aid. As a whole the scene mainly serves to illustrate the character of the Mediaeval knight and his relation to his immediate liege lord, especially his fidelity to him at any cost.

The last act of Grabbe's *Barbarossa* is a dramatization of Frederick's triumph over Henry, the latter's exile, and the Emperor's departure for the Orient.

Henry and the Emperor fight a decisive battle on the banks of the Weser, in which many of Germany's great heroes fall. The terrible conflict is finally decided by a duel between Henry and Barbarossa. Frederick defeats his rival, allows him to live, but compels him to leave the country.

According to the author's source, no such battle was ever fought. After Henry had lost the city of Lübeck, which was his last stronghold, he decided to surrender to the Emperor. In November, 1181, he therefore appeared before the Imperial Diet at Erfurt and begged of Frederick to be forgiven. The noble-hearted ruler granted his request, but insisted that he must leave Germany for four years.

If Raupach had written scene one, he would undoubtedly have used the facts as Raumer gave them. Grabbe, however, chose only those events which served both as historical and



poetical material. Frederick's triumph over Henry taking place on a battle field instead of at the Diet, presents at least the same substance of history, but what a difference dramatically, when in the one instance the Emperor quietly outlaws him, and in the other he strikes him down, then standing over him exclaims, "Ich bin Herr der Welt!"

The detailed account of the battle has no further value other than to illustrate the character of Mediaeval warfare. In the second scene, Grabbe takes us to the barren coast of East Friesland to witness the Archduke's departure. Henry and the Duchess are discussing their fate, when suddenly, crawling on hands and feet, Ludolph, a true knight, who has followed the Duke's tracks, appears on the scene. Mortally wounded, he now, after uttering a few words of praise, drops dead into his Lord's arm. Deeply moved, the exiles leave for the edge of the water, where a ship is nearing to carry them to England.

This scene is again a powerful presentation of a single historical fact. The author needed but to know that Henry was banished, and his powerful imagination supplied the rest. Nothing mentioned in history, nor anything contrary to it is given, yet the scene is historical in spirit.

The third and last scene, with which the author closes his drama, contains the return of Prince Henry from his marriage in Italy, and Frederick with a group of noblemen entering upon a crusade. Both events are true, but neither took place immediately after the Diet at Erfurt, as stated in the drama.





## HENRY VI

As in his first dramas, Grabbe began his Henry VI by choosing, from the life of his chief character, a group of events which represent a check or reverse in his career. These events have been chosen because of their dramatical content and have been artistically combined and elaborated so as to present a single poetical whole which conveys the true spirit of the history of that period. Literal history again has been subordinated to poetical effect. Yet more actual facts have been used in the drama than in Barbarossa.

The opening scene of act one has a function similar to that of scene one in the first act of Frederick Barbarossa. Its purpose is to present a few characters which are to give an environment to acquaint the audience with the general situation of things before introducing the later mass action.

Although a pure invention as regards actual historical facts, the characters presented in this scene illustrate very truly not only the Norman attitude toward a Hohenstaufen rule, but also the Norman's love for his country and its national ideals.

Guiscard and Bohemund are true patriots who loathe the Emperor. Count Acerra expresses the general love of freedom and loyalty to the Italian cause by crowning, in the name of the Italian nobles and clergy, Tancred king of Sicily.

We have here then, the Italian situation as a part of



the whole environment into which we are to be gradually to be introduced. This preparing the way for the audience, disposes at once of the difficulty to adjust immediately the whole situation so that a general conception of what is to be presented can be comprehended. In the last part of the scene, Grabbe introduces a bit of humor with which he ridicules the use of strict military discipline in searching expeditions.

In the beginning of scene two, we are made further acquainted with the relationship existing between the new emperor and his Norman subjects. Henry and the Empress are conversing on the veranda of a palace near Naples. Constance pleads with her husband to refrain from resorting to such extreme measures in his dealings with her people. In scornful words Henry defies all admonition and advice and swears he will subdue them. Their conversation is interrupted by the appearance of a ship on the horizon, which soon proves to be a vessel carrying the dead Barbarossa. A mourning scene follows. Henry is deeply moved, but soon recovers from his grief, and is about to take leave of his family to return to Germany, when the Archduke of Austria enters to complain of insults received at the hands of Richard of England. He is followed by Archbishop Ophamilla of Sicily and Achmet the Saracen, who bring the news that the Sicilians have set up Tancred as their king. Diephold and the Admiral of Naples then enter and announce the arrival of Richard in Trieste. The scene closes with Henry's commanding the Admiral and Diephold to continue the campaign against Naples.

What we have here is a combination of the chief happen-





ings during the first year of the new ruler's reign. The events that occurred in Germany have been carried to Italy and have been combined with the incidents that immediately followed Henry's unsuccessful attempt to conquer Naples.

Actual facts, true in every way, are, first, the sacrificing of the city of Tusculum for Roman good will; secondly, Henry's alliance with the Saracen; thirdly, the Sicilian revolt; and fourthly, the continuation of the campaign against Naples.

The news of his father's death reaches Henry in Thuringia before he leaves Germany. The Archbishop of Ophamilla remained true to the Emperor, but according to Raumer, did not appear before him at this time. The ruler of Austria was insulted in Palestine by the king of England, but Henry knew this before he left Germany, and finally, Richard had returned from the East six months earlier, and had landed in Zara.

In addition to these events occurring earlier than the time stated in the drama, Grabbe has referred to Henry's son Frederick II, who was first born three years later. The only incident contrary to history is Frederick's body being brought to Italy. He was buried in Antiochia, (Raumer 2, 297).

The content of the conversation of his characters, the author has taken both from the substance of Raumer's direct statements and from what he read between the historian's lines.

In the first two scenes of act two we have left Italy, and are now in Austria to witness the capture of Richard of England. Scene three carries us to the northern coast of Germany, where Henry the Lion is crossing from England, and in



scenes four and five we have before us the capture and utter destruction of the city of Bardewick.

In presenting the imprisonment of the king of England, Grabbe has, as a rule, used actual facts. These, however, he has slightly modified by introducing additional incidents which were necessary to present the material dramatically. The whole development of the plot is a combination of events identical in character. The four narrow escapes that Richard had from being caught, and his final capture, Grabbe has combined into one occasion by inventing characters who in their conversation and action present the essential incidents leading up to the king's capture.

The first scene presents Richard in disguise and sitting in an inn, awaiting his servant, whom he has sent to buy food with a costly ring. His growing impatience, because of the boy's tarrying, is observed by two Austrian peasants who are beginning to suspect him. A number of other Austrians now enter and announce the return of their Duke, who has commanded a sharp lookout for the stranded king of England. The belated servant returns and is brutally beaten by his master. As the bystanders interfere, the king, tired of being a fugitive, now makes himself known, whereupon he is taken prisoner and sent to the Archduke of Austria. In the second scene, Blondel, a devoted singer of the king, finds his master, and while conversing with him, is also taken prisoner. Enraged at this, Richard tries to break through the guards, but is overpowered.

In comparing these two scenes with the author's source,





we find a mention of the ring and of the servant, but not that the ring was sold nor that the servant was ill-treated. According to Raumer, the king's betrayal was due to his servant being recognized by a fellow crusader.

History mentions a Blondel and his conversation with the king, but claims that he escaped to England, and brought the news of Richard's capture to his mother.

Scene three opens with a few subjects of Henry the Lion awaiting his return from England. From the conversation of these characters, one learns in a general way of their dissatisfaction with present conditions, and of their longing for the return of the "Herzog". Harsh and brutal as he might have been, they nevertheless love and adore him. His former cruelty is forgotten, and that of their present rulers is exaggerated. Great is, therefore, their joy as the ship bearing him and his son now appears on the horizon. As it nears the shore, they retreat to the bushes, to allow him to be alone with his son when he lands.

His hair now as white as snow, but apparently having lost little in physical strength, the great Archduke now steps again on German soil. Touching are the words to his son as he tells him of his wonderful mother, and noble are his expressions of love and admiration for the dead Emperor in Palestine.

Crying "Hie Guelf", his subjects now surround him and lay their troubles at his feet.

The entire scene is invented. Grabbe has taken the historian's mention of the Archduke's return, which, however, occurred before Frederick's death, and has elaborated it by



adding incidents and characters that fit the occasion. No actual facts were employed. Raumer refers to a number of events that occurred immediately after Henry returned, but these the author has used in the next scene.

While Henry was on his way to the coast, after being exiled, he sought a night's lodging in Bardewick, a city which had received many favors at his hand. Upon arriving at the gates, he found them locked. The citizens had turned against him, and in shameful words and actions were now insulting him from the walls.

Upon returning from England, one of Henry's first moves was, therefore, to punish the ungrateful Bardewickans, which he did by completely destroying their city. This destruction is the content of the last two scenes. Scene four gives us an insight into the life of the Mediaeval merchant, comparing him, as it were, in his revelry and general weakness with the sturdy peasant and the brave knight. The last scene is an account of the burning of the city and of the arrival of the imperial messenger to denounce Henry's action.

In comparing these scenes with the author's source, we find the first to be an invention, but the second an exact reproduction of the historian's account, except that Raumer omitted the arrival of the imperial messenger.

The two scenes of act three comprise the events taking place at the Diet of Hagenau and the Emperor's reconciliation with Henry the Lion. The first scene opens with a love chat between Prince Henry Junior and Agnes of Hohenstaufen. Agnes is ever quieting her betrothed, who fears the wrath of the Em-





peror when he learns of their marriage. The Diet now assembles, and the question of electing a Bishop of Liege is first discussed. The matter is settled by the Emperor appointing Lothar of Herstael as the former bishop's successor. Richard of England is then brought before the meeting, and is accused first of insulting the Archduke of Austria; secondly, of leaving the king of France in Palestine; and thirdly, of deserting Phillip's sister, whom he had promised to marry.

Richard met every accusation either with a firm denial or with a satisfactory explanation. He was, however, not released until he had pledged to pay a ransom of 100,000 marks to the Emperor, 50,000 to the king of France, and 20,000 to the Archduke of Austria. Blondel was then given his freedom, and sent to England to collect the vast sum.

As the Diet is discussing the question of making the imperial throne hereditary, a messenger from Sicily informs the Emperor of Constance's imprisonment. Agnes then enters and tells Henry of her marriage with the Guelf. Enraged, the Emperor orders the same to be cancelled, but Agnes' beauty and affectionate pleadings finally cool him. Upon her suggestion, Henry then leaves the Diet and hurries Braunschweig to become reconciled with the Archduke before the latter dies.

In this scene, we have again an illustration of Grabbe's wonderful ability to combine widely separated events into a single well constructed dramatical whole. The only event which really took place at the Hagenauer Diet was the trial of England's king. Grabbe's treatment of this particular incident



is at once clever and artistical. He employs the actual facts, but spices them with a humor which makes the account exceedingly interesting. The news of Agnes' marriage and Constance's imprisonment reached the Emperor a year earlier than is stated in the drama. The election of a bishop of Liege took place at the Diet of Worms, in January, 1191, and the question concerning the heredity of the imperial throne was first discussed two years later, when Henry really had a son.

In the last scene we have as actual facts the Emperor's reconciliation with Henry the Lion and the latter's son falling heir to the Palatinate.

The meeting of Henry VI and the Archduke, however, did not take place in Braunschweig, but at the Diet of Dullethe in May, 1192, and according to Raumer, it was the Prince, and not Agnes, who brought them together. The Archduke did not die until August 6, 1195. Henry's vision, in which the Archduchess appears as the white woman, is a clever invention, and one with which the author presents a climax of the Duke's grief.

Act four opens with Tancred, the king, Acerra, Matthäus, and other nobles assembled in the imperial palace in Venice to discuss the outcome of the rebellion. All but the king are elated over the results. Ophamilla and Count Aversa are brought before the meeting and condemned to death. The life of Constance is then demanded, but Tancred shields her and later sets her free. This displeases Matthäus and Acerra, which in turn exasperates the king, who leaves the assembly accusing them of crowning him for their own personal interests.





According to Raumer, Grabbe has slightly exaggerated the evil in Matthäus and has favored Count Acerra. The latter's victim was not Aversa, as the author gives it, but Roger. The incident concerning the Archbishop Ophamilla, whom Grabbe has falling into the hands of his villain Matthäus, is an invention.

In the words of Tancred as he leaves the assembly, we have his awakening expressed. The behavior of Matthäus and the Count reveals to him the fact that their interest in his welfare is not due to patriotism, but to furthering their own gain. According to history, Tancred set the Empress free because of the Pope bringing pressure to bear. The author has omitted this fact in order to emphasize the king's fear of Henry.

The second scene takes us into the interior of the castle of Rocca D'arce, which is being besieged by Tancred. Diephold and Achmet have concentrated here the entire imperial strength in Italy to await the return of the Emperor.

The content of the scene is chiefly an account of the terrible suffering from starvation and disease. The besieged are about to despair when suddenly the news reaches them that Henry has arrived. A Saracen horseman breaks through the Norman line to greet the Emperor. On his return he is mortally wounded, but lives to give Diephold his Majesty's message.

No such detailed account of affairs is reported in history, yet the author is justified in drawing his conclusions as he did, from the few facts that are given. Raumer refers to Rocca D'arce as an impregnable stronghold, and states that Count Diephold, aided by the Saracens, succeeded in defending it against



the Norman attack until the Emperor arrived. History also justifies the emphasis that the author places upon the Saracen influence. These heathens had gained a foot-hold in Southern Italy, and had become a menace to the surrounding Christians. Instead of eliminating them, the Emperor allied himself with their leader, and used these "enemies of the Cross" as a force with which to control his Sicilian subjects.

The last scene of act four opens with a short dialogue between Guiscard and Tancred, in which the latter expresses his regret of ever having accepted the Norman crown. German troops suddenly appear on the scene, and Guiscard is killed. Tancred escapes, but later dies of grief and disappointment. The Emperor now appears and meets Constance, Diephold, and Achmet. The scene closes with a Crusader inquiring why the soldiers of the Cross are not sent to Palestine.

This scene is a presentation of general facts without referring to any particular event. According to the author's source, none of the incidents are taken directly from history. Raumer refers to Henry's return to Italy, and cites incidents which occurred at this time. These, however, the author was unable to use because of their lack of poetical quality. Grabbe, therefore, again resorts to invented scenes in which he presents the leading facts and ideas which he has gathered from a particular period.

The last act presents the imperial couple and their retinue before the cathedral in Palermo. Here Matthäus and Count Acerra are condemned to death, and the quarrel between





Genoa and Pisa over the control of Palermo is settled by giving it to neither. A sorceress is then sentenced to be burned at the stake for predicting that Henry's death would occur within two days.

Scene two is a discussion between a shepherd and his servant over the outcome of the Norman rebellion. Its purpose is to present the general rural indifference toward the change of rulers, and the stability of primitive life in general amidst all changes.

In the last scene, the imperial party is ascending the side of Mount Aetna. As they reach the summit, a messenger from Greece arrives to announce his ruler's willingness to comply with the Emperor's wishes. Elated over this report, Henry now declares that he will not rest until he has conquered the world, but, with the same breath, he gives a scream and dies.

In this act we have again no particular event in history presented until we arrive at the Emperor's death. The individual characters of the first scene are taken from the author's source, but do not appear in connection with the historical events. Where the author in former acts used real incidents and supplied them with invented characters, he now employs true characters in connection with invented scenes. Poetry and history are, therefore, not to be sought in the incidents but in the individual characters. This change was necessary because of the lack of dramatical quality in the events following Tancred's death. The nature of the reply from Greece coincides with history, but this message had been received six months earlier. In the last



scene, the author combines, as it were, the beauty of nature, as seen from the summit of Mount Aetna, with the Emperor's pomp and grandeur. The nature and suddenness of Henry's death is exaggerated. According to Raumer, the Emperor became ill from drinking cold water while overheated. He was taken to Messina, and there died September 28, 1197.





## CONCLUSION

In thus pursuing Grabbe's Barbarossa and Henry VI, we find a unique treatment of history in the drama. Like Lessing and Schiller, he believes in the doctrine of poetry first and foremost, and like them, sacrifices literal history for healthy dramatical effect.

Unlike them, however, he values the historical fact as greater poetical material than mythological incidents. Fabulous or invented incidents that do not and could not occur under any circumstances Grabbe seldom employs. He prefers plausible invented events, however, to unpoetical facts, yet actual facts confirmed by historical evidence and dramatical in character are to him of exceedingly great merit.

Lessing welcomed the true events whenever they came to his notice, but never would search for them. Grabbe, on the other hand, like Grillparzer, sought for them diligently, and whenever he found one he would strip it of its commonplace material and garb it in a dramatical attire which at once pleased and presented the truth.

The construction of his drama shows that the author took, as it were, a panorama or bird's eye view of the entire career of each of his two chief characters in order to find the event with which the whole situation first becomes dramatically interesting. Having fixed this point, he then proceeds to develop the proper mediaeval environment in which to place his characters.



This method of acquainting the audience with the general situation of what is to follow, Grabbe illustrates in the two introductory scenes that precede the actual mention of both Henry the Lion and Tancred.

The chief meritorious characteristic of his construction is his combinations of events widely separated by time. These are principally of two kinds, those which occurred previous to and those which took place after the time stated in the drama. The Hagenauer Diet is the one important event which is a happy combination of both earlier and later incidents.

These groupings of historical occurrences ignore the time element in history, but not at the expense of either actual history or poetry. Not a single combination is perceptibly unnatural. None but a specialist would be able to detect any displacement of either characters or events, nor would the average scholar feel the absence of any omitted material.

To state the whole again then in a few words, one can safely say that Grabbe's motto was: Poetry first and history second, but yet essential.

\*\*\*





BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. C. D. Grabbe's Sämmtliche Werke und Handschriftlicher  
Nachlass - Hrsg. von Oscar Blumenthal, Detmold,  
Meyer, 1874
2. Kleist's, Grillparzer's, Immermann's, und Grabbe's Dramat-  
urgie - Hrsg. von F. J. W. Scholz, München, 1912.
3. C. D. Grabbe, Eine Einführung - O. Nieten, Berlin, 1902
4. Hebbel und Grabbe - A. Kutscher, München, 1913
5. System der dramatischen Technik, mit besonderer Unter-  
suchung von Grabbe's Drama - A. Perger, Berlin,  
A. Duncker, 1909
6. C. D. Grabbe's Sämmtliche Werke - Hrsg. von E. Grisebach,  
Berlin, 1902
7. Geschichte der Hohenstaufen - Friedrich von Raumer,  
Leipzig - F. A. Brockhaus, Berlin, 1871







UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 086859912